



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

John
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,362	09/03/2003	Martin Monteagle Browne	NIDN10520 DIV	4211

36335 7590 05/18/2005

AMERSHAM HEALTH
IP DEPARTMENT
101 CARNEGIE CENTER
PRINCETON, NJ 08540-6231

EXAMINER

NEWHOUSE, NATHAN JEFFREY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/654,362

Applicant(s)

BROWNE, MARTIN MONTEAGLE

Examiner

Nathan J. Newhouse

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No.

6,223,918. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because U.S. 6,223,918 discloses the claimed invention except for the protective portion being made separate and then attached to the moulding(cap).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the protective portion separate and then attach it to the moulding(cap), since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No.

Art Unit: 3727

6,659,296. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because U.S. Patent No. 6,659,296 teaches a cap for a container comprising a moulding (50) and a protective portion (60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-2 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by von Schukmann '163.

Von Schukmann teaches a cap 6 with tongues 9(retaining portion) for protecting and holding closure member 4(stopper) on a container 1. The cap has a removable portion 8 to access the contents via a needle/syringe through the closure member 4. Von Schukmann further teaches a protective portion 11 that is threadable attached to cap 6. Von Schukmann further teaches a tamper evident member 13.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed February 28, 2005 have been considered but are not found persuasive.

With respect to applicant's arguments concerning the rejection of claims 3-5 under 35 USC 101 over claims of US Patent No. 6,659,296, applicant's amendments to

Art Unit: 3727

the claims have traversed this rejection. However these claims (3-5) are now properly included in the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims of US Patent 6,659,296. This change in the rejection was necessitated by applicant's amendment, therefore it is proper to make this office action final.

With respect to applicant's arguments concerning the double patenting rejection of claims 1-10 with respect to US Patent No. 6,223,918, applicant states that the '918 patent does not provide any detail on how the wall is formed with the cap. On the contrary, the '918 patent states that the wall is formed around the periphery of the engagable member, but further details are not recited. However, the drawings clearly show the wall formed in one piece with the cap(moulding) and around the periphery thereof and as set forth in the rejection, this is an obvious variation of the invention now claimed. Therefore use of the specification of the '918 patent is permitted. *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 441-42, 164 USPQ 619, 622 (CCPA 1970).

With respect to applicant's arguments concerning the double patenting rejection of claims 1-10 with respect to US Patent No. 6,659,296, applicant states that the '296 patent does not provide any detail on how or where the protective portion is attached to the moulding. On the contrary, the '296 patent states that the protective portion is formed separately and attached and extends about the periphery of the engageable member. Furthermore, the drawings and specification elaborate and further describe that the protective portion is located at the edge and around of the cover member. The differences between the claims of the instant application and those in the '296 patent

Art Unit: 3727

are only obvious variations and therefore the use of the specification of the '296 patent is permitted. *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 441-42, 164 USPQ 619, 622 (CCPA 1970).

With respect to applicant's arguments concerning the rejection of claims 1-2 and 7-10 as being anticipated by Von Schukmann, applicant states that the protective portion is formed as a unitary member with the cap body. As set forth in the above rejection, Von Schukmann teaches allow of the limitations of the claims. Clearly the protective portion (11) of Von Schukmann is not a unitary member with the cap body (6).

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3727

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan J. Newhouse whose telephone number is (571)-272-4544. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 6:00 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee W. Young can be reached on (571)-272-4549. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Nathan J. Newhouse
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3727